

Sri V. VENKATAPPA.—Sir, I beg to move :

“That the Mysore Anatomy Bill, 1957, as amended, be passed.”

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is :

“That the Mysore Anatomy Bill, 1957, as amended, be passed.”

The motion was adopted.

MYSORE MOTOR VEHICLES TAXATION BILL, 1957.

Motion to consider.

Sri C. M. POONACHA (Minister for Home Affairs).—Sir, I beg to move :

“That the Mysore Motor Vehicles Taxation Bill, 1957, be taken into consideration.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

“That the Mysore Motor Vehicles Taxation Bill, 1957, be taken into consideration.”

***Sri C. M. POONACHA.**—Sir, in moving the Bill for the consideration of the House, I have not much to add except to state that this measure has been brought before this House for consideration with a view to bring about a uniform pattern of motor vehicle taxation for the new State of Mysore. We have for the different integrating areas different taxation Acts in force and that is causing considerable difficulty to vehicle owners and also to transport operators. With that end in view, this Bill has been framed in such a way as to include the most salient parts of the different taxation Acts that were in force in the integrating areas.

The main features of this Bill is indicated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons. The Bill envisages the abolition of municipal tolls all over the State. Hitherto, in some areas the practice of collecting tolls on motor vehicles in municipal limits is in force and hereafter it is proposed to do away with the imposition of such municipal levies. A second feature of the Bill is

that it proposes to exempt from payment of tax motor vehicles used solely for agricultural purposes. Further, it also proposes to prohibit local bodies from levying tax or tolls on motor vehicles and provides for payment of compensation for loss of such income to the local bodies, whether municipalities or local bodies as the case may be. In the financial memorandum that is attached, the financial aspects have also been examined and the probable income that could be collected under this taxation measure is also broadly indicated.

Sir, I for one think that there would not be much of a controversy in accepting this Bill. However, this Bill is now placed before the House for its consideration and I rise to commend that the Bill be taken for consideration.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN (Kolar Gold Fields).—Sir, while introducing this bill, the Hon'ble Home Minister was pleased to say that it would be non-controversial. I am sorry he has misread the situation in the House as well as outside. If he has just cared to look into the number of memoranda that he received, he would have disabused himself of any such illusion. But unfortunately since he still seems to suffer from the illusion that this Bill is non-controversial, I must place some facts to prove that it could not be considered so non-controversial. Even from the point of view of the interests of the constituency which he represents, it should be considered controversial, for the simple and obvious reason that the level of tax proposed in so far as the area from which the Hon'ble Minister hails, is nearly four to five times the tax that he had chosen to levy while he was Chief Minister of Coorg.

Sir, I beg to place a few comments which are in the nature of opposition to some aspects of the Bill. While saying this, I do not want to say that there should be no tax on motor vehicles at all. My point is simple it is that the principle of uniformity has been seized with a view to increase the levy on motor vehicles all over the State, whether in old Mysore or in the integrating areas. I am sure that while

(SRI M. C. NARASIMHAN)

discussing such a taxation measure it has to be considered along with many other aspects, namely, the position of the consumer and the position of the industry, *i.e.*, the motor vehicle industry and lastly its impact on road traffic. But unfortunately, all these factors have not been given adequate attention in this Bill.

There is no gainsaying the fact that this Bill introduces an additional levy, as I shall presently explain. This taxation, I am sure, is not going to be borne by either the bus-owners or the owners of goods vehicles, leave alone the cases of cars for private use.

The other owners of State Carriages—as they are called—or passenger buses and goods vehicles particularly, would certainly pass on the levy to the passenger. If I say this, the Home Minister may not be in a mood to accept it. But I have the authority of the Taxation Enquiry Commission in respect of this matter. Though it is a very simple proposition, at times the Ministers have got a way of saying that the levy will not be passed on to the consumer and that it is only the middle-men that pay and therefore the taxation is justified. On page 38 the Taxation Enquiry Commission—unfortunately, the Finance Minister is not here; the Taxation Enquiry Commission's report is his Bible—has stated.

“Ultimately the burden of both motor vehicles and the taxation on passengers and goods falls on the user of the motor vehicle and neither tax can be considered in isolation.”

This was the conclusion to which a responsible body, presided over by no less a person than Dr. John Mathai, has arrived at on the question as to who would ultimately bear the tax. Is there justification for this increased levy? Sir, I feel there is absolutely no justification for an increased levy.

Similarly the Mysore Finance Enquiry Committee—now it has been thrown into the dustbin and the Finance Minister is always chabby whenever a Member refers to it for the simple reason

that some of the recommendations are not very palatable—has stated on page 62.

“We are not therefore in favour of either increasing the rates of the existing taxes or levying a new tax on passengers and goods.”

It will be seen from a statement of the comparative figures of taxation at present on selected vehicles in Mysore and Madras that the level of taxation in this State is practically equal to that of Madras, which ranks amongst the highest in the whole of India. It is my task to prove that the taxes now proposed is much higher in some instances than what was prevailing in old Madras. I will not go into the entire schedule but will only cite a few instances.

In the case of a thirty-seater passenger bus, *i.e.*, 28 seated and 6 standing the rate of taxation in old Mysore was Rs. 2784. In Madras it was 3,000 rupees and as per the Bill it is Rs. 3420. There is a definite increase of Rs. 420 over the Madras rate. For a forty-seater bus, *i.e.*, 38 sitting and 8 standing, the old Mysore rate was Rs. 3,304 in Madras it was Rs. 4,800 and as per the Bill now proposed it would be Rs. 4,640. I do not know why in the case of a forty-seater bus, the Home Minister has shown a soft corner, though, in the other case the rate proposed is higher than what existed in old Mysore State.

Coming to medium cars, if used as a Taxi, the rate of tax in old Mysore used to be Rs. 240, in Madras it was Rs. 300 and the present Bill makes it Rs. 300. If used for private purposes, the old Mysore rate was Rs. 120, in Madras it was Rs. 156 and as per the Bill it is Rs. 120.

Coming to the goods vehicles, an appreciable increase in the rate of taxation is evident. In the case of goods vehicles with a laden weight of 5,600 lbs. the old Mysore rate was Rs. 800, the Madras rate Rs. 800 and as proposed in the Bill it is Rs. 848. In the case of goods vehicles with a laden weight of 11,200 lbs., the rate was Rs. 1172 in

the case of old Mysore, Rs. 1172 in Madras, but the Bill now makes it Rs. 1200. Similarly in the case of a laden weight of 20,160 lbs. it was Rs. 1708 in old Mysore, Rs. 1708 in Madras and Rs. 1,756 as per the Bill.

Now, Sir, it is crystal clear from what I have stated above that the new Bill contemplates an increase, unnecessary increase, over what was prevalent even in Madras. Even the Taxation Enquiry Commission have definitely stated that the rates, so far as motor vehicles were concerned, should not be above the Madras rates. In fact in the year 1950 when the Central Government appointed a Committee to go into the taxation on motor vehicles, it was definitely stated that Madras rates should be the ceiling level. They definitely deprecated any tendency to a heavy increase of the levy on motor vehicles. Unfortunately, the State Governments did not fall in line with the view of the Central Government. If only they had accepted the recommendations of that Committee or even if they had accepted the recommendations of the Taxation Enquiry Commission, it would have meant a definite encouragement to the motor industry. No doubt it would have meant a fall in the revenue of the States through taxation on motor vehicles. As I have already pointed out, the Motor Vehicles Taxation Enquiry Commission have stated as early as 1950 that Madras Rate should be the ceiling; it should be far below the Madras rate and it should never exceed the Madras rate. Unfortunately, in spite of the authoritative pronouncement of the Taxation Enquiry Commission, in spite of the authoritative pronouncement of the Central Enquiry Committee who had better information to go into this question, who had better sense of judgment of the interest of the motor vehicles industry, our State has chosen to go far in excess of what has been suggested by them. I do not know why the Finance Minister has got a particular bias against goods vehicles. There is a discrimination in respect of goods vehicles. There is an increase over the old Mysore rate in respect of goods vehicles listed

in Part A of the schedule under item 3.

There is a flat increase of Rs. 12/- over all the goods vehicles whose laden weight is above 650 lbs. Further, the rate on motor vehicles plying for hire in cities—they may be big cities which are to be listed and described by a subsequent notification,—have also increased. In Part B also, in the case of motor vehicles whose owners are residing outside, the goods vehicles have come in for a discriminatory levy. For, in the case of motor cycles, bicycles and personal cars, there is no increase so far as the old Mysore area is concerned. I wish to confine my remarks to this particular aspect. Why should there be this discrimination? What justification is there for discriminating between goods vehicles and vehicles run for hire in various cities and passenger vehicles as against private cars? Is it being suggested that goods vehicles are being solely used by the richer section? Is it being suggested that passenger vehicles are not being used by the poor villager? I cannot understand why there should be this discrimination. Secondly, Sir, coming to the increase, I do not know what reason, what rhyme or what logic there is for the increased levy proposed. For example, so far as goods vehicles are concerned, as I have stated earlier, there is a flat increase of Rs. 12. I do not know what particular charm the Home Minister has got for that particular figure 12. Why he should have chosen 12 and why he should not have chosen 13 is a thing which is beyond my comprehension. It is not a thing which could be derived from the statement made by the Home Minister. It cannot be in the name of uniformity because, as I told you earlier, it is in excess of the Madras rate. If we are on par with Madras rate, then at least one could have insisted that it is in the name of uniformity that this rate has been increased. It is for the Hon'ble Minister to explain why he has fixed Rs. 12 and why not Rs. 13.

Now, coming to the next point, take the motor vehicles for hire. Here again one cannot understand the distinctions made. For example, Sir, on page 13 in

(SRI M. C. NARASIMHAN)

Part A item 4 (ii) it is said that in the case of vehicles permitted to carry more than five persons and plying exclusively on routes within the limits of cities and towns, for every seated passenger, the rate is Rs. 23. Formerly in the old Mysore area, it was Rs. 20. So, there is an increase of Rs. 3. While in the case of other vehicles, *i.e.*, vehicles which do not use pneumatic tyres, the rate is Rs. 35, *i.e.*, same as in old Mysore area. So, in the case of a particular vehicle which is plying for hire, if it uses pneumatic tyres, Rs. 3 extra should be levied whereas in the case of vehicles which does not use pneumatic tyres, there is no distinction proposed in the rate. What is the logic behind this? It is beyond any one's comprehension. If at all there is justification for increasing the levy on every seated passenger in the case of vehicles plying for hire which use pneumatic tyres, there is greater justification for increasing the levy in respect of other vehicles which do not use pneumatic tyres for one simple and obvious reason that it is the vehicle which does not use pneumatic tyre that introduces an element of greater wear and tear on roads. I can understand that particular argument. Now, coming to item (ii) (b), there again for every passenger which a vehicle is permitted to carry in the old Mysore area, it was Rs. 8.25 but now it is to be Rs. 8.50. There is an excess of 25 nP. But when you go to vehicles with pneumatic tyres, it is increased by 50 nP. What logic is there, I cannot understand. Now, coming to the next, plying on routes other than those mentioned above, *i.e.*, State carriages which carry bigger number of passengers, for every seated passenger it was originally Rs. 12 in old Mysore area, but now it is Rs. 30. That is an excess of Rs. 18. Whereas in the case of other vehicles which do not use pneumatic tyres it is Rs. 15. So, there is an excess of Rs. 18 in the case of vehicles which use pneumatic tyres and the rate is Rs. 15 in the case of those which do not use pneumatic tyres. It can be sustained only on one ground and that is that our Hon'ble

Home Minister is opposed to use of pneumatic tyres.

5-30 P.M.

Again for every standing passenger each vehicle was permitted to carry in old Mysore it was Rs. 5; it is now doubled to Rs. 10. Formerly it was Rs. 7-8-0 in the case of those which did not use pneumatic tyres and now it is doubled to Rs. 15. In all this, I once again submit that I cannot understand what logic is there. I cannot understand the conundrum on the basis of which this is worked up. This is so far as the old Mysore is concerned. If you refer to other areas then the situation is worse, for the simple reason that the increase is four-fold in many cases. According to the Memorandum which has been submitted by the Hyderabad dealers, it is 30 times. But anyway here, is a notification which was issued on March 29, 1957 by the Government of Mysore. They felt the necessity to give a sort of reduced rates. But now they are going back on that. Here the rate is proposed to be doubled in respect of vehicles in Bombay area; in respect of goods vehicle Government found it necessary that there should be a concessional rate. Let me give the details. In case of vehicles with a registered laden weight of total 30 Cwts, the tax was Rs. 58 in Bombay, Hyderabad, Mysore and Coorg but as per the Bill it will be Rs. 133. And vehicles which carry a weight of 30 Cwt. but does not exceed 60 Cwt. it is Rs. 80 as per the old regulations but as per the Bill it is Rs. 200 now. I do not want to burden the House with all these details, but my point is this that the rates proposed are very heavy. We must compare the rates proposed with the rates prevalent in old Mysore which according to a responsible body, the Finance Enquiry Commission, did not call for a revision as they were already very heavy. Even in case of old Mysore there is an extra levy. As for the other areas like Coorg, or Hyderabad or Bombay, the increase or extra levy is something which cannot be borne at all. All these things have got to be taken in conjunction with the effect that it will have on the entire trade.

Now so far as the Road Transport Industry is concerned, this industry has not received adequate attention at the hands of the Planning Commission either in the First Five-Year Plan or in the Second Five-Year Plan. This has been recognised even under the Second Five Year Plan. I shall read a passage from the Second Five-Year Plan.

"The total number of motor vehicles on the road, during the last quarter of 1954 was estimated to be 353,000 which, though larger than the number at the commencement of the first plan, i.e., 294,727 must be considered very small, having regard to the size of the country, its road mileage and its population. The general growth of economic activity in the country in recent years and the inability of the railways to meet all the traffic demands should provide considerable opportunity for the expansion of road transport. This has, however, not occurred."

That means in the First Five-Year Plan period despite the fact that certain amount of money, that is, nearly Rs.12 crores was provided for the nationalised road transport alone there was not adequate growth in this industry, adequate meaning commensurate with the needs of a developmental economy which we are envisaging. Further it says:

"The inadequate development of road transport during recent years has been attributed to a number of causes. Among those commonly cited are the fear of nationalization, high levels of taxation on motor transport, restrictions placed on inter-state services and on long haulages under the Code of Principles and Practice, etc..."

So, even a responsible body who drafted the Second Five-Year Plan has come to the conclusion that the progress recorded in the First Five-Year Plan was not adequate.

And not merely that. Even though the Second Five-Year Plan itself has

devoted some attention to this and has made certain allocation so far as the national sector is concerned, a big portion of the outlay is to be consumed in buying new vehicles. But so far as the road goods industry is concerned not enough attention is given. They have not stressed the need for developing that industry, the need for giving adequate protection to the industry and increasing production so that it might meet the needs of developmental economy. In fact, the all-India bodies connected with road goods industry have estimated that the situation at the end of the Second Five-Year Plan would be four times worse than what it was at the beginning of the Second Five-Year Plan. If I were to explain, it means that our requirements at the end of the Second Five-Year Plan so far as road goods vehicle industry is concerned would be four times more but we are not in a position to meet the needs of our economy in spite of the Plan, in spite of the huge outlay and in spite of what all we are trying to do.

Sri C. M. POONACHA.—May I just ask for a clarification? Is the Hon'ble Member referring to the road goods vehicle industry or the transport industry? He has been repeatedly using the expression road goods vehicle industry.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—If I remember aright, the Second Five-Year Plan lumps up all the things together. It lumps up railway transport and water transport. So far as the Plan is concerned, it uses the expression "Transport". It includes all the other types of transport. That is why I particularly confine my attention to the road goods vehicle industry. The Chapter which I read refers only to the road transport. So, at the end of the Plan period we will be in a very sorry state of affairs. In other words, it means that our goods vehicles, that is to say, lorries, etc., are not adequate and they will be compelled to take a bigger burden than they can afford to do and in the context of our developing economy, since the railways will not be in a position to meet the increasing demands, should we burden this industry to such a point that it will not be able to carry

(SRI M. C. NARASIMHAN)

out the task that the Second Plan imposes on it or should we consider the question of taxation in such a manner as to help the road goods vehicle industry etc, to help the increasing number of lorries etc. coming forward to meet the increasing demands? This is the only simple proposition that I wish to place before this House. As I said, even the Second Plan has neglected this industry. This is the opinion in responsible quarters. If you take the proportion of total outlay in respect of railways and in respect of road transport, you will be definitely convinced that the amount of attention that was paid by the Second Plan to the railways was more and that the amount of attention that was paid to the road transport industry was less. For example, the Second Plan outlay in the national sector for the road transport is Rs. 27 crores. So far as the railways were concerned, in the First Plan the outlay was Rs. 400 crores whereas for road transport it was a poor meagre sum of Rs. 8.97 crores for the vast country of India. So, when this is the situation, I definitely feel that this increased levy is a thing which will definitely cripple the economy, ruin the transport industry as such and at the end of the Plan we will be faced with a serious situation. Supposing taxation is increased on goods vehicles? Is it being suggested that the owners of the fleet are going to bear this burden? Not at all. On the other hand, it is going to be passed on to the merchants who in turn will pass it on to the beloved consumer.

There is another point and that is very important. This taxation measure has got to be viewed in the context of the development of our automobile industry. This is a very important point to which I would like to draw the attention of the House. The Second Five Year Plan has not made any substantial provision for the development of an independent automobile industry in our country. It is never sufficiently realised that the automobile industry is an independent adjunct to our economy and that it should be developed as a neces-

sary element in our economy. We find from the Second Five-Year Plan that only a meagre amount is going to be allocated for this purpose. It is very essential that greater and greater encouragement should be given to the automobile industry. We must consider what is the situation of the automobile industry now. I am particularly stressing this point because this taxation measure means an additional levy on the goods vehicles and motor vehicles which are already in a difficult situation. I shall give some figures which will convince the House about what I am saying. So far as India is concerned; as it is backward in other matters, it is backward also in respect of the automobile industry. The table before me shows that the population per motor vehicle so far as India is concerned is 1,188. That means for 1,188 persons there is one motor vehicle in our country whereas for one vehicle in the U.S.A., there are three persons, in Czechoslovakia there are 74, in the U.S.S.R. there are 107 and in France there are 66. Then, so far as the number of vehicles available is concerned, we are much behind.

Coming to another aspect, in the year 1953 we had to import nearly Rs. 1,421 crores worth of motor vehicles parts. Again, in 1953-54 we imported 10,000 vehicles and in 1954-55 we imported 15,000 vehicles. I am bringing this to your notice for the simple and obvious reason that so far as motor vehicles are concerned, we are hopelessly dependent on foreign imports. This is not an independent industry which can bear the brunt of all the taxation measures that every State Government seeks to impose when it likes in order to wipe out its deficit. This industry is not in that position. This aspect has got to be taken into account before introducing any taxation measure, but unfortunately this aspect has not been taken into account while introducing this Bill. When this industry in our country is hopelessly dependent on foreign imports, when it cannot stand on its own legs and when it cannot replenish itself, it is wrong to impose such a heavy tax on this industry and no person with a

certain sense of patriotism can afford to support this measure to increase the tax as proposed in the Bill.

One of the objects of the National Planning Commission set out by Sri K.T. Shah and which was presided over by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was to ensure an economic and efficient transport system in the country. That is also one of the declared aims of the Second Five-Year Plan and the Planning Commission. Though, as I said earlier, they have not translated that slogan into reality, all the same this was one of their objects. Is it being suggested that this taxation measure will help to build an economic and efficient transport system? No, on the contrary, it will defeat that very object.

Now I come to one or two details in the Bill. When I looked into the Motor Vehicles Taxation Act I found that the justification for the existence of the motor vehicles tax was the state of affairs of our roads. This is directly related to the condition of our roads. The taxation is justified for the simple reason that the motor vehicles use our roads which fall into disuse by and by. It is taken for granted that the net receipt from motor vehicles tax should be used or earmarked for road development, but this aspect is totally missing in this Bill. In the clause relating to utilisation of proceeds of the tax, there is no mention that the net receipts after making the necessary allocations for compensation to local bodies, etc. will be devoted for the development of roads. You will also find that this Bill cannot be justified in the name of uniformity also for the simple reason that the Hyderabad Motor Vehicles Taxation Act has got a section which says that the net receipts *minus* the compensation to the local bodies should be earmarked for a road building fund. Not merely that, it is definitely stated in that Act that it should be a grant or fund which cannot lapse. Every year they were compelled by a statutory provision to use it only for development of roads and they could not use it for any other purpose. How this provision in that Act can be taken away in the

name of uniformity is a thing beyond my comprehension.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Was it the provision that the whole of the amount realised from motor vehicles taxation should be earmarked for road building fund?

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—The provision is the net receipt minus the compensation to local bodies should be earmarked for road building fund. The local bodies were to be compensated for loss of revenue due to abolition of wheel tax and other taxes. So the rest of the amount after providing for compensation was to go to a road building fund.

Then, there is another aspect which I would like to bring to your notice. Clause 20 of the Bill does not take into account that there is in existence an Act called the Hyderabad Motor Vehicles Taxation Act because you will find that the clause reads thus:

“(1) From the proceeds of the tax collected under this Act every year and subject to such conditions as the State Government may specify—

(i) there shall be paid to each local authority, which prior to the commencement of this Act was being paid any amount under section 22 of the Mysore Motor Vehicles Taxation and Tolls Act, 1951, or section 9 of the Bombay Motor Vehicles Tax Act, 1935, or section 10 of the Madras Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1931, or section 10 of the Coorg Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1932, a sum equivalent to the said amount every year.”

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI (Afzalpur).—May I correct the Hon'ble Member? No amount was being collected under this Act, by the local bodies in Hyderabad. The State Government was directly collecting vehicles tax and tolls tax whereas in other States it was a different affair.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—If I remember aright, there is a provision in the Hyderabad Act that 25 per cent

(SRI M. C. NARASIMHAN)

of the net receipts must go for payment of compensation to the local bodies. If I am wrong I am subject to correction. In spite of such a provision being there in the Hyderabad Act, if you omit any reference to the Hyderabad Act in clause 20, it means that you are not prepared to give any compensation to the local bodies in Hyderabad, because, under clause 23 you are repealing the Hyderabad Motor Vehicles Taxation Act. That was the Act which provided for payment of compensation to the local bodies in Hyderabad. That means that so far as Hyderabad is concerned, where even according to the admission of the P.W.D. Minister the position of roads is very bad, you are going to say that no compensation shall be paid to the local authorities. Where is the justification for this? Is this an inadvertent omission or is it a deliberate omission?

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—The next sub-clause provides for that.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—As the clause stands at present Government cannot allocate any funds towards compensation to the local bodies in Hyderabad area. That is my reading of the clause. If it is wrong, I am open to correction.

So, Sir, as I was saying, so far as this particular clause is concerned, it is absolutely necessary that the net proceeds should go towards a road development fund and it should be a non-lapsable grant as in the case of Hyderabad. That would ensure that the collection will definitely be utilised for the purpose of road development and for the purpose of maintenance of roads, etc.

There is another aspect to which I wish to invite your attention and that is clause 7.

“Where a tax on any motor vehicle has been paid for any period and it is proved to the satisfaction of the prescribed authority that the vehicle has not been used . . . etc . . .”

There, unless it has been used in a public place, there should be a refund

of the tax. There is already an amendment tabled by my friend and I do not wish to take much time on this matter.

There are two more points and I am finished Sir. Though this does not come within the strict purview of the Bill, even then it is an important matter, and that is this. So far as administration of these and cognate matters are concerned, in the old Mysore State we had Regional Transport Authority and Authorities under that. There was a district level authority whereas now it is thought fit to divide the whole State into four or five divisions. This has led to a lot of difficulty so far I can understand. The reason is obvious. In respect of licenses etc. and all other cognate matters, formerly it was being administered at the district level which was more accessible to the parties. It may be said that local influences were sought to be brought in when there were these District Regional Authorities. But, all the same, it was convenient to parties. Now, it is shifted on to a new authority and to a different area, at a higher level which causes a lot of inconvenience so far as the parties are concerned. It is a matter to which Government should give serious attention. I am not suggesting that it should be brought in the shape of an amendment. I am only making a suggestion that the old system that was there—the Regional Transport Authority at the district level—should be restored so as to facilitate administrative matters.

The last thing to which I wish to refer is with regard to the condition of the workers in this industry. Though it does not arise out of this, I still take this opportunity to make a statement. Unfortunately, the Minister for Labour is not here. So far as the working condition of the workers is concerned, it is not at all satisfactory for the simple reason that there is no regulation re: hours of work etc, in practice. Though there is a Central Act on allied matters it is not at all enforced. Neither the hours of work are regulated nor the emoluments. If such a sort of affair is continued, it would have a very serious effect on this industry.

The regulations are respected more in the breach than in observance. While making the above remarks, I appeal and submit to the Minister and the Government to take adequate steps to see that the condition of road transport workers, whether in the State sector or in the private sector, is made as satisfactory as possible. Government of India contemplated a legislation, but unfortunately, nothing has come out. Once again, I appeal to the Government to take adequate steps and prevail on the Central Government to see that a

Central Legislation is brought into being.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Rajaiah Shetty will speak next. We shall now rise and meet again at 1 P.M. tomorrow.

The House adjourned at Fifty-Eight Minutes past Six of the Clock to meet again on Thursday, the 1st August 1957.
